

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 8 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by diFazio et al. The Examiner has allowed claims 15-22 and stated that claims 2-3, 5-7, 9 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon or rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claim 1 by combining it with Claim 2 and canceling Claim 2. Claim 3 has been combined with the subject matter of Claim 1. Claim 4 is dependent upon Claim 1, which as amended should be in condition for allowance so that Claim 4 is also allowable. Claims 5-7 are dependent directly or indirectly on Claim 4, which has been shown allowable above, and are therefore also allowable. Although the Examiner rejected Claim 8, it is now dependent upon amended Claim 1 and should thus be allowable. Claim 8 has been amended to insert a missing period at the end of the claim. Similarly, Claim 9, which is dependent upon amended Claim 3, should now be allowable. The Examiner rejected claims 10-12. Claim 10 is dependent upon amended Claim 1, should thus now be allowable, and claims 11 and 12 are dependent upon Claim 10, so that these claims should now be allowable. The Examiner objected to Claim 13, which is dependent upon Claim 1. In view of the amendment to Claim 1, Claim 13 should now be allowable.

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner states that Claim 14 is objected to in Item 7 thereof. However, in the second paragraph on Page 2, the Examiner states that claims 14 and 22 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species. The Examiner later states that Claim 22 has been rejoined by the Examiner.

This leaves the status of Claim 14 unclear. Applicants believe that because Claim 14 is dependent upon allowable Claim 1, Claim 14 should also be allowable in this application since it is dependent from a generic claim and should not be withdrawn from further consideration.

One additional item requires clarification. In the Office Action Summary, Item 10 states that the drawings filed on November 18, 2001 are and then none of the boxes have been checked by the Examiner. Applicant's presume that the drawings have been accepted since there is no detail about objections to the drawings, would appreciate that the record be clarified by stating that the drawings have in fact been accepted by the Examiner.

According, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Instruments Incorporated

By 

William B. Kempner
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452